REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 5-10, 26, 27, 29-34, 36 and 39-44 are pending. In the Office Action dated December 21, 2009 the Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 5-10, 26, 27, 29-34, 36 and 39-44 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 7,518,422 to Johnson.

Because 35 U.S.C. § 121 prohibits a double patenting rejection in this situation, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5-10, 26, 27, 29-34, 36 and 39-44 and requests the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 121 states in part that "A patent issuing on an application with respect to which a requirement for restriction ... has been made ... shall not be used as a reference ... against a divisional application." U.S. Patent No. 7,518,722 issued on an application which is a divisional of the present application. Accordingly, a non-obviousness-type double patenting rejection is inappropriate. See MPEP 804.01.

A restriction requirement issued by the Office on June 23, 2005 required imposed a two-way restriction requirement between Group 1, characterized by the Examiner as directed toward a memory circuit, and Group 2, characterized by the Examiner as directed toward a delay locked loop circuit. See Restriction Requirement, June 23, 2005.

Responsive to the restriction requirement, Applicant elected Group 1, and filed a divisional application directed to the claims of Group 2, which application has since issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,518,422. The claims of Group 1 were, at the time of restriction, directed toward device and system board claims. See Originally-filed claims 1-10 and 25-44, December 11, 2003. The allowed Group 1 claims above continue to be directed toward devices and system boards. The claims of Group 2 were, at the time of restriction, directed toward phase-locked loop and method claims. See Originally filed claims 11-24 and 45-49, December 11, 2003. The issued Group 2 claims in U.S. Patent 7,518,722 are directed toward delay locked loops, circuits, and methods.

Having imposed a restriction requirement in the application family, the Office is prohibited by 35 U.S.C. § 121 from now issuing a double-patenting rejection between very groups of claims that were subject to the restriction. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/733,605

Applicant respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance.

Favorable consideration and a timely Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

DORAEY & WHITNEY LLP

Jennifer Lane

Registration No. 51,916

Telephone No. (206) 903-8836

JML:alb

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6100 Seattle, Washington 98101-7043 (206) 903-8800 (telephone) (206) 299-9288 (fax)